

Appl. No. 10/789,076
Amdt. dated 10/30/2006
Reply to Office action of 10/11/2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGs. 4, 5a, 5b, 7, 14, and 15. The sheet numbers on which these drawings appear remain the same. FIGs. 4 and 7 have been amended to emphasize that each comprises two separate, but related, parts. In FIGs. 5a, 5b, 14, and 25, the pointer '12' now appears only once in each drawing.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner's ruling with respect to the restriction of claims has been duly noted. Claim 34 has, accordingly, been canceled. A divisional application will be filed at the appropriate time.

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections based on objections to the drawings.

The multiple appearance of pointer '12' in FIGs. 5a, 5b, 14, and 15 has been corrected. Pointer '12' now appears only once in each of these figures. Examiner's comment that FIGs. 4 and 7 are each actually two figures that should be given separate labels is understood. However, in each case the two parts are closely related. Specifically, the intent is to track the value of the P1 field at different points along the length of P1. If the upper and lower parts of FIGs. 4 and 7 are given separate labels, implying thereby that they are separate figures, there is no guarantee that the upper and lower portions of the figure will be on the same page in the final document.

In order to convey the close relationship between the upper and lower parts of FIGs. 4 and 7 we have added a set of broken lines that extend from the lower to the upper portion and we have enclosed the two portions within a single box. We trust that these changes will enable examiner to withdraw this particular objection.

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112:

The limitation "an inner surface that is coplanar with that of said second lower part" in line 10 of claim 18 has been provided with suitable antecedent basis by amending the first paragraph describing the first embodiment in the specification.

Appl. No. 10/789,076

Amdt. dated 10/30/2006

Reply to Office action of 10/11/2006

The limitation "an inner surface that is coplanar with that of said second lower part" in line 10 of claim 26 has been provided with suitable antecedent basis by amending the second paragraph of the description of the fourth embodiment.

The limitation "said fourth lower part" that appears in claims 18 and 26 has been corrected to read "said third lower part" in both cases.

Applicant wishes to express his thanks to examiner for her meticulous examination of our application and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

Saile Ackerman LLC
28 Davis Avenue
Poughkeepsie
NY 12603

By 

Stephen B. Ackerman
Reg. No. 37761